

**REMARKS**

Claim 31 has been added. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 9, 18, 23-24, 26-27 and 29-30 have been amended. Applicants graciously acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 8. Claims 8 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this or other applications.

Claims 4, 8, 9-11, 14, 18, 23, and 30 are objected to as being informal. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claim 8 has been cancelled, and the remaining claims have been amended to obviate the objection.

Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 16, 18 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,957,205 to Liongosari ("Liongosari") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046276 to Gutierrez et al. ("Gutierrez"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In contrast to the invention of claim 1, as amended, Liongosari does not disclose or suggest determining an education curriculum based on contents request information, nor does it suggest extracting contents elements based on such education curriculum. Gutierrez is cited for the purpose of disclosing extracting contents when a contents request is acquired and does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Liongosari. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, should be allowable over the combination of Liongosari and Gutierrez. Claims 2-7 and 9-22 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1, and on their own merits. Claims 27 and 29 have been amended to include similar limitations as those recited in claim 1 and are therefore allowable over the combination of Liongosari and Gutierrez as well at least for the reasons provided above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liongosari in view of Gutierrez. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 recites "a contents management system comprising a contents management apparatus and ... a contents providing apparatus." The Office Action appears to have not

differentiated between these two separate components of the claimed system. Claim 1 relates to “a contents management apparatus.” The Office Action’s analysis of claim 24, however, cites the same sections of Liongosari that were previously cited referring to claim 1, as though claim 24 referred to the same contents management apparatus of claim 1. Applicant submits that Liongosari does not disclose the claim 24 “contents management system comprising a contents management apparatus and ... a contents providing apparatus ... wherein the contents providing apparatus includes a contents request acquiring unit ... a contents element extracting unit ... a contents restructuring unit ... and a contents providing unit.”

Moreover, claim 24 has been amended to include the limitations related to the education curriculum determining unit as described above. As explained above, Liongosari does not disclose these aspects of the invention and Gutierrez, which is cited for teaching extracting content based contents request information, does not cure the deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 24 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and is allowable along with claim 24, and on its own merits.

Regarding claim 26, the Office Action states “[c]laim 26 is essentially equivalent to claim 24 with claim 25 incorporated into it, and therefore rejected on the grounds set forth above for claims 24 and 25 . . .” Claim 26, however, is not essentially equivalent to claims 24 and 25. Claim 26 recites “contents management system comprising: a contents management apparatus ... and a contents providing apparatus ... wherein the contents management apparatus includes a contents request acquiring unit ... a contents element extracting unit ...” Again, it appears the Office Action did not fully appreciate the difference between the “contents management apparatus” and the “contents providing apparatus” claim elements. Nevertheless, claim 26 has been amended to include limitations related to the education curriculum determining unit as described above. For reasons already provided, Applicants submit that claim 26 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liongosari in view Moskowitz. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 30 has been amended to recite limitations related to the education curriculum determining unit as described

above. For reasons already presented, Applicants submit that claim 30 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In view of the above amendments, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Anthony M. Briggs

Registration No.: 52,654

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant